TRANSACTIONS
OF THE
PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

1855.—No. 9.

May 25 (Annual General Meeting).

The REV. T. OSWALD COCKAYNE in the Chair.

The Paper read was :—

“On Greek Accentuation;” by Professor T. HEWITT KEY.

The position which Greek scholars in this country occupy in reference to the accentuation of that language, appears to be not a little unsatisfactory. On the one hand, it is practically considered to be a sort of high misdemeanor to print or write a line of Greek prose or verse without those little marks called acute and circumflex; on the other, the very persons who rigorously exact the addition of the symbols, quietly ignore the object for which they were invented. The accents live indeed for the eye, but are nonentities for the ear, although one might have expected that spoken language would have been thought entitled to priority of respect over that which is expressed in writing.

One of the most recent writers on the subject in this country was a member of this Society, whose decease we had to lament a few years back; and while condemning the inconsistency between the theory and practice of other English scholars, we are bound to admit that Mr. Pennington zealously contended for the adoption of a pronunciation in accordance with the accentual marks; and in one respect he had a great advantage over the majority of writers who preceded him, in having witnessed with his own ears the modern habit of pronunciation on Grecian soil in familiar intercourse with natives.

It may seem an imprudent step on the part of the present writer to take up a matter in which his own special studies give him no right of speaking with authority, and when he, never having visited Greece, presumes to maintain a very different theory. But, in the first place, it is of the essence of Mr. Pennington's views that he deems it a duty to unite a strict observation of the accentual marks and of the long and short syllables, although he himself informs us in as many words, that the modern Greeks in their pronunciation attend to accent alone, without any regard to quantity. Thus he may be called as a witness against his own cause. Now it is almost entirely on evidence drawn from the writings of Forster and Primatt, that is, on the evidence adduced by Mr. Pennington himself, that the present argument is founded. At any rate, a careful and repeated perusal of his *Essay on the Pronunciation of the Greek Language**, has had for its sole result, a confirmation of the views which the writer expressed on this subject more than twenty years ago†. Further, it may be urged in reply to any charge of intrusion within the domain of Greek scholars, that a looker-on often sees errors to which those constantly engaged on a subject become blinded by routine and familiarity.

The subject of course is one of old standing, and in fact has been so often debated, that it may be difficult to gain attention to a reopening of the argument. The hope of attaining this object on the present occasion is chiefly founded on the feeling that a few pages may be enough for the statement of the essential points, which have been spread out into whole volumes under the pens of Forster, Gally, Primatt, and our lamented member.

The position here asserted is, that the system of accentual marks which appear in Greek books is an anachronism when applied to the writings of Homer, Aeschylus, Thucydides, Aristophanes, &c., as those marks were invented to denote the altered pronunciation of a much later date. There occurs

* London: John Murray, Albemarle Street, 1844.

† *Journal of Education*, Oct. 1, 1832. Some passages from this paper are here repeated.

in Mr. Pennington's book (p. 84), a quotation from Montfaucon, which with him we may readily accept as the evidence of a competent witness :—" Haec omnia [the accentual marks] ante septimum saeculum a librariis neglecta prorsus videntur : nam codices vetustissimi quinti sextive saeculi iis prorsus carent : quae ante septimum saeculum, in solis grammaticorum libris observata fuisse videntur." The earliest manuscripts are admitted to have no accentual marks, except perhaps the celebrated Alexandrian MS. of the New Testament ; but here too the fact that accents are found only in the first page, seems to lead to the conclusion that they were a subsequent addition.

In the twelfth century all parties are agreed that Tzetzes wrote his iambic tetrameters catalectic in full observance of the pronunciation denoted by the accents and utter disregard of quantity, as in the line :—

‘Οπόσον δύναιτο λαβεῖν ἐκέλευε χρυσίον,

that is, in pronunciation, something like—

‘Οπωσον δυνάτο λαβεῖν ἐκέλλυε χρυσεῖον.

The same principles are apparent in the writings of Constantinus Manasses, who lived about the same time :—

‘Ο γάρ τοι παῖς τοῦ Κώνσταντος ἄρτι λαβὼν τὰ σκῆπτρα,

(Τοῦνομα δὲ τῷ βασιλεῖ βρεφόθεν Κωνσταντίνος)

Στόλφ βαρεῖ τὴν Σικελῶν καταλαμβάνει νῆσον

Καὶ πάντας τοὺς αὐτόχειρας καὶ τοὺς ὀλεθρεργάτας

Τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ πατρὸς ἐνδίκως ἀποσφάττει,

Καὶ σὺν αὐτοῖς Μιζίζιον τὸν τετυραννηκότα,

(quoted by Mr. Pennington in p. 295 from Mitford on the Harmony of Language, ed. 1774, p. 247). In these lines, if read with a careful observation of the accents as marked, and an equally careful disregard of what we commonly consider to be long vowels, diphthongs, &c., a metrical result is produced which cannot be mistaken : and the only wonder is, how the writer could have persisted in such a metre through the 6733 verses of his *Σύνοψις ἱστορική*, unless it be the additional wonder how his readers or hearers could have survived the infliction of so much monotony. The metre itself was of course fami-

liar to Aristophanes, but it is only an exceptional case that in his writings we find a line where an attention to the marked accents is not fatal to his verse; such as the instance quoted by Mr. Pennington from the *Lysistrata* (v. 310) :—

Κᾶν μὴ καλούντων τοὺς μοχλοὺς χαλῶσιν αἱ γυναῖκες.

In the comic writers of Rome it would be perhaps easier to find duplicates of such a line as—

Salútant ad cenám vocant advéntum gratulántur.

But before we proceed to a detailed consideration of the facts upon which we would found our conclusions, let us first attend to some general principles which may serve to guide us.

The rudest nation has still some perception of harmony, and though an uneducated ear may not be able to analyse the feeling which is excited, or determine any law in the causes which produce that effect, it is still qualified to ascertain the fact, whether any given combination of sound is pleasurable or the reverse. And it is not a very strong position to assume, that if in any age or any country any form of melody has been highly gratifying to a considerable portion of a nation, that same form of melody would also be appreciated to a considerable degree by any other people of any other period. It is true that the ear may be so highly educated as to understand and take pleasure in a species of music that to vulgar ears is without meaning or beauty; but a national taste for music cannot depend upon the few that are so favoured. If this doctrine be true, it seems to follow that in nearly all questions affecting the metrical laws of the Greek and Latin poets, one of our best guides, if not the very best, is our own notion of what is pleasing. On the other hand, if this principle be disputed, then we shall not only be deprived of every satisfactory criterion that can be applied, but we are confessedly engaged upon a subject that can lead to no useful result. If the melody of ancient verse is no longer melody to our ears, if its life has fled from it, we are only digging for a skeleton, or rather, a number of scattered bones, which if not actually disgusting, at least can give no feeling of pleasure. But in fact the laws of melody, as of everything else

that depends on physical causes, are the same for ever. What was gratifying to the hearers of Homeric verse would in general be gratifying to ourselves, if the true pronunciation were preserved; and we may be perfectly sure that we have made but a very slight approach to that true pronunciation, until there results from it a melody which is pleasing to the untutored ear. For in a point of this kind more reliance may be placed upon the natural feeling of a clown than on the taste of a Hermann, which is easily deceived for the very reason that it is educated.

One of the chief reasons which has impeded the correct solution of the problem before us, appears to be the oblivion of a principle which shows itself more or less actively in the history of every known language, viz. that time is always effecting changes of pronunciation. A careful reader of Chaucer, Shakspeare, or even Milton, becomes fully aware of such differences, when he compares the mode of accentuation which their verses demand with that which now prevails. Even within our own memory such changes have established themselves, as *advertisement* and *révenue*, in place of *advertising* and *revénue*. In Latin again, with every century between Ennius and Juvenal, to go no later, words exhibit what is called a variety of quantity. *Hannibális* and *Hamilcáris* in the oldest heroic poem of Rome, shock one whose ideas of Latin pronunciation are obtained from the *Asdrubale interempto* of Horace. *˘Acheruns, mīlūūs, lārŭă, grātīs*, are trisyllabic words commencing with a long syllable in Plautus, but either lose this quantity or are reduced to disyllabic words—*˘Acheruns, mīlvus, lārva, grātis*—in later writers. But if such changes are visible in our own and in the Latin language, what was to be expected in the Greek language in which there now exist a series of writers extending over a space of nearly three thousand years? It may also be observed, that these changes are subject for the most part to certain general laws, the most important being a tendency to abbreviation of sound; and this again is but a particular instance of the general law, that man is always striving to economize his labour. Thus consonants get omitted, long vowels shortened, and by the contraction of short vowels, whole

syllables disappear. Trace, for example, the five-syllable form *mea domina* through the Italian *madonna*, the French *madame*, the English *mádam*, down to *maam*, *mam*, *mum*, and in the pages of Dickens the still shorter form *mim*. To say that in process of time the accent of words is gradually removed further from the end, is only another way of expressing the same result. But while this is the prevalent direction of change, there are instances that run counter to this course. Not unfrequently some provincial language, hitherto buried in obscurity, all at once by some freak of fortune obtains a victory over another dialect, which, spoken in the capital, had till then held undisputed supremacy. Such an invasion would probably supplant an abbreviated language by forms of broader and fuller sound, for it is especially in cities that men, feeling the value of time, have the stronger disposition to rapidity of utterance. Thus in the preceding passage of Manasses, the word βασιλεως, written with an ε and ω, but accented on the penult, virtually substitutes for the Attic genitive that other form which belongs to the Ionic dialect, βασιληος. Again, in *αυτόχειρας*, we have a somewhat clumsy mode of designating what might have been more suitably expressed by *αυτουχειρας*, in the first element of which we see a genitive, while the *χειρ* with its simple vowel appears to be a more legitimate form than *χειρ*. The existence of the oblique cases *χειρος*, *χειρι*, &c. is familiar to all, and if the nominative occurs only with a diphthong, it is because the original *χερς* (for such is the form which analogy leads to) was first assimilated to *χερρ*, and on the omission of one of these liquids, the vowel received the usual compensation. On the other hand, the diphthong in *χειρ*, by a very natural error, led to the use of the same in several of the oblique cases, but not to the dative plural, where the presence of two following consonants made it more difficult to introduce a diphthongal sound*. In

* In supposing *χειρος*, &c. to have been formed from the nominative *χειρ* by a false analogy, we are supposing precisely what has occurred in the past-perfect tense of many verbs, where *-ειμεν*, *-ειτε*, are entitled to some long vowel or diphthong, as being contractions from *εσαμεν*, *εσατε*, but *ετερυφεισαν*, not having undergone any similar compression, ought not to have been replaced by *ετερυφεισαν*.

claiming a genitival origin for the first syllables of *αυτοχειρ*, we are guided partly by the sense, partly by the conviction, that such is the just explanation of many compound words. Thus *Πελοποννησος*, as a friend observes, appears to be a corruption of *Πελοπος νησος*, where the final *σ* of the genitive is assimilated to the following liquid. *Ἀλωνησος* is another instance. This passage of one consonant into the other, has its complete parallel in the formation of certain adjectives from neuters in *ος*, as from *ερεβες*-* (better known in the form of the nom. *ερεβος*) comes *ερεβεννος*; from *φαες*-, *φαεννος*, subsequently modified to *φαεινος*; and from *αλγες*-, *δεες*-, (through a lost *αλγεννος*, *δεννος*) *αλγεινος*, *δεινος*. Thus we hold the German *mondenlicht* to have in its middle syllable a suffix of genitival power, and so to be more complete than our own *moonlight*, in which the suffix *en* probably once existed, and was afterwards absorbed in the preceding liquid, just as our word *iron*, used as an adjective, may have been originally pronounced *iron-en*, like *leaden*, *golden*, *brazen*†. A case still more in point is the name *Sevastóvol* (Sebastopol)—for so is the word pronounced by Russians and Greeks—and this represents an older *Σεβαστου-πολις*. *Κωνσταντινουπολις* again is the orthography still prevailing in modern Greek, and so justifies the accent which we ourselves assign to *Constantinople*. In the same way *agricultura* by its quantity asserts the genitival character of the first element.

Another instance where the shorter form of the Attic dialect appears to have been replaced by one broader and earlier, occurs in *όπόσον* (see the line from Tzetzes). Now the Greek *ποσος* and *τοσος* correspond in power to *quantus* and *tantus*; and if the *t* in these Latin words had passed into an *s*, as we know historically was the case in *pulsus*, *mersus*, &c., then we should have had for the Latin *quāsus* and *tāsus*, for the *n* before an *s* would have been silent‡, and the vowel by com-

* The soft breathing is purposely omitted, as being utterly useless itself, besides that the omission leaves to the aspirate a more prominent character.

† Compare the still stronger case of *Oxford* from *Oxenford*.

‡ It is no doubt in this way that we are to explain the assertion of Gellius, that the *i* of *insanus* (i. e. *īsanus*) was long, whereas the *i* of *inclitus* was short.

pensation lengthened. These would have been in agreement with the words *πόσος* (*πῶσος*) and *τόσος* (*τῶσος*). What has just been said, may be compared too with the relation subsisting between *εικοσι* (cf. *τριακοντα*) and *viginti* (cf. *vicensumus* and *viciens* or *viciēs*). To return for a moment to *αυτόχειρας* or *αυτουχερας*: we would add that this adjective was probably formed from the phrase *αὐτοῦ χειρ*, ‘with his own hand,’ much as *pro consule*, *pro praetore*, and in later times *vice regis*, *pro portione*, were united to form the declinable words *pro-consul*, *proptraetor*, *vicere*, *proportio*.

In tracing the changes of pronunciation down a series of writers, we would put inquirers on their guard against what appears to us as a grave error. A word is often said to have such a quantity in epic poetry; another form they say is preferred by the tragedian; and again in comedy it is laid down without any pretence of explanation, that a third form of pronunciation is prevalent. It is no doubt true that in the more elevated strains of poetry a fuller expression is probable than in the familiar and therefore shortened language of common life; but the main differences we believe to be independent of the particular kinds of literature; and the prevalent error, as we hold it to be, in this respect, we would attribute to the accident that certain periods are often fertile in some peculiar form of writing. Again, we are ready to admit that the fame of the Homeric writings, as also of the Attic tragedians, was such that they found imitators in their peculiarities, long after great changes in the spoken language had established themselves. But if the writings of the Alexandrian school, for instance those of Apollonius of Rhodes, were thoroughly intelligible to any of his countrymen, it was only to the educated, that is, to those who were familiar with the Homeric and other celebrated productions of earlier times. Yet so deeply fixed in the minds of the Greek rhetoricians was the idea that the language of Homer was only the language of epic poetry, that poor Herodotus is charged by Longinus with the heinous offence of writing in a style too Homeric and poetical. Thus the simple-minded historian had even a worse fate than Molière’s Monsieur Jourdain—writing

poetry all his life without knowing it. However, when late writers amused themselves with composing epics or tragedies after the fashion of Homer, Sophocles, &c., they were not writing for the great public, but doing very much what is now done more or less well by those who contend for the Porson and other prizes at our Universities. Those, on the other hand, who wished to make themselves intelligible to the masses, and endeavoured to work upon their feelings, followed the idiom of their own day; and their compositions, from their popular character, obtained the appropriate title of *versus politici*. Such were the lines above quoted from Tzetzes and Manasses.

But while language is changing in pronunciation, the imperceptible and unnoticed character of the change is a reason why the alteration in orthography does not proceed with it *pari passu*, and thus, in perhaps all written languages, what is presented to the eye is in arrear of the spoken sounds. The words *boat*, *meat*, in our own tongue, for example, were once disyllables, as they still are in the mouths of many rustics—*me-at*, *bo-at*; but the diphthongs, if so they can be called, now perform the office of what is merely a long syllable. Again, *health*, *stealth*, *breadth*, *bread*, the preterite *read*, and the substantive *lead*, have two vowels as written, when on the ear there falls nothing but what we usually represent by a short *e*, as in *red*, *led*, &c.

To apply this to the Greek language will, it is believed, go far to explain away the difficulties which have beset the present question. When Euclides as archon introduced into public records in the year 403 B.C. the new vowel-symbols H and Ω, he no doubt did good service; but the benefit was not permanent; and were he now to come out of his grave, he would be surprised to find the same letters not unfrequently performing the office of the short *ε* and *ο*. Thus *ἵψηλη* and *ἀνθρωπος* of olden time have acquired the pronunciation *ἵψελη* and *άνθρωπος*, though still written with a long vowel in the penult, *ἵψηλη* and *ἄνθρωπος*.

We cannot expect any large amount of historical evidence as to changes in Greek pronunciation, simply because such

changes take place for the most part without much observation being attracted to them, and at any rate without any written record of the fact. Still there are found occasional notices to our purpose in the grammarians and scholiasts, and, in addition to this, the best assistance may be obtained from a consideration of metrical principles. When Homer wrote *οφίς* at the end of an hexameter (Il. xii. 208), he had no choice but to use the vowel *ο*, as the symbol afterwards appropriated to a long *ο* had not in his day obtained currency. We have reason then to find fault with the—carelessness shall we call it—of those editors, who, substituting the *ω* in other passages, omitted to do so here. Again, Hermann has noticed that *Οἰλεὺς* is always trisyllabic in Homer, of two syllables in Euripides, and written with a single vowel *Ιλεὺς* in Lycophron. Another example of changed pronunciation is in the Greek form of the god Aesculapius. It so happened that in the days of Demosthenes the popular ear required that the word should be pronounced as an oxyton, *Ἀσκληπιός*, although the orator for a time persisted in what was then an offensive peculiarity, throwing the acute accent on the long vowel *Ἀσκληπίος* (see Plutarch, *Lives of the Ten Orators*, ed. Wytttenbach, iv. 390). The well-known line of Homer commencing *Ἀρες*, *Ἀρες* (Il. v. 31), naturally attracted the attention of the grammarians, and though *Ἄρες*, *Ἄρες* is the accentuation now established in editions, we learn from Eustathius that one of the grammarians, Ixion, thought it more correct to write *Ἄρες*, *Ἄρες*. The words *εἰρημος*, *ἑτοιμος*, *ὁμοιος*, *ακρατος*, *τροπαιον*, are repeatedly the subject of remark, as in Eustathius, Suidas, and the *Etymologicum Magnum*. These words, it is true, eventually had an acute accent on the antepenultimate, but in older writers had a circumflex we are told on the penult, which would agree with the pronunciation now commonly prevailing in England. Thus Suidas says that *τροπαῖον* was the accentuation of the *παλαιοὶ Ἀπτικοί*, viz. Eupolis, Cratinus, Aristophanes, and Thucydides; whereas Menander preferred *τρόπαιον*. Again, *εῤῥῆμος* is more than once ascribed to Homer by Eustathius (pp. 258 and 748, ed. Basil), and also by *Etym. Magn.* (*sub voce*); but, says the

latter, *παρὰ τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς προπαροξύνεται*. Now how did Suidas know that Aristophanes pronounced *τροπαῖον*? above all, how did Eustathius know that Homer pronounced *εῤῥῆμος*? Assuredly it will not be contended that a statement to this effect had been handed down from the time of the poet by tradition, much less will any one have the hardihood to assert, that accentual marks were already affixed in the days of Homer. How then, we repeat, did Eustathius arrive at the knowledge? Common sense answers: from his own consideration of the poet's metre, precisely as Grimm makes similar inferences as to the pronunciation of old Teutonic poets from their verses. In the same way Suidas drew his inferences as to *τροπαῖον*, from an actual perusal of the old comic poets, and no doubt extended his inference to Thucydides, from a belief that living at the same time and in the same city, he would naturally follow the same pronunciation. Thus Suidas and Eustathius at any rate cannot justly be included among the ancient writers on grammar to whom Mr. Pennington would attribute the unqualified doctrine that "accent and quantity are entirely distinct from each other" (p. 169). But if the accentual system as found in the pages of Homer rests solely on the authority of grammarians who lived many centuries after him, we also are, on the same principle, entitled to criticize their proceedings. Thus when we find *θῦμον* in the text of Sappho (Dionys. Hal. *περὶ Συνθεσ.* 23), although the common dialect required *θυμὸν*, we may claim *θῦμον* for Homer also. Again, when we find the grammarians divided as to the accent of *αὐταρ* (Il. ii. 1), Callimachus making it an oxyton, others a baryton, we may perhaps be allowed to incline in favour of the latter for Homer's time.

But besides comparing one dialect with another, or the Greek of one age with the Greek of another, it may be useful to observe the way in which words were transferred from Roman to Grecian orthography, or the converse. Now the Latin *comites*, becoming a title, was written at Byzantium in the form *κόμητες*, which would never have been tolerated had the *η* then denoted only a long vowel. On the other hand, it

was long ago noticed by Scaliger, that Latin poets, in borrowing Greek words, adopt that metrical value which is implied in the accents, giving these a preference over all claims on the part of what would seem to be syllables long by nature or position. Thus Plautus (*Curcul.* i. 1, 2) in adopting the Greek name Φαίδρωμος, uses *Phaedromus* always with a short penult. Again, frequent reference is made in his plays to the Macedonian coins, in all which cases the second syllable of *Philippus* (Φιλίππος) is short (see three examples in a single scene of the *Bacchides*, iv. 8. 27, 38, and 41). Ovid again (*Met.* viii. 207), having his eye on 'Ορίωνος*, writes: *Strictumque Orionis ense*. In the hendecasyllables of Sidonius, we find the following instances of the same principle: Εὐριπίδης: *Orchestra quatit alter Euripides*; Μαρσύας: *Marsyaeque timet manum ac rudentem*; Ἄρατος: *Diversas Arato vias cucurrit*. In Ausonius the accents of τρίγωνος and τετράγωνος have led to such lines as: *Per totidem partes trigonorum regula currit*, and *Fulgur tetragono aspectu vitale cucurrit*. Lastly Prudentius invariably shortens the penults of *idola* (εἰδῶλα) and *eremus* (ἐρημος), the latter word preparing us in some manner for the utter disappearance of the middle vowel in our own *hermit*. But it is unnecessary to produce more instances. Servius indeed, (*de Accentibus*), boldly affirms universally: *Latini eundem accentum quem Graeci habent efferunt in Graecis nominibus*. We hesitate however in following his authority when he asserts that Simoeis (*Aen.* i. 100) and Periphas (*Aen.* ii. 476) in Virgil, are to be accented on the penult (Σιμόεις, Περίφας).

But the difficulty which here stops us, Mr. Pennington would ascribe to a defect in our own organs, for he and many other scholars contend that the Greeks of olden time found it practicable to fulfil the requirements of both accent and quantity in words where they appear to be repugnant; for example, he asserts that we may pronounce *άνθρωπος* with an acute accent on the initial syllable, and at the same time with the long quantity of the penult. Thus Matthiae too observes (*Trans.* p. 953):

* It is true that Ορίωνος is somewhat contrary to analogy in Greek; cf. Κρονίωνος and Κρονίωνος, μεμᾶωτος and μεμᾶοτος.

“These two considerations [accent and quantity] must be combined in the pronunciation, and it is equally incorrect to pronounce merely according to accent, *e. g.* ἄνθρωπος, Ὀμηρος, as *ānthrōpōs*, *Hōmērūs*, or merely according to quantity.” “In German” he adds, “the pronunciation is nearly the same as in Greek, with *accent* and *quantity* both;” and he then represents with musical notes what he conceives to have been this pronunciation. The English editor however honestly observes: “Whether this musical diagram may accord with the inflexions of a German voice in common conversation, I cannot say, but *we* have nothing akin to it.” And indeed it may be strongly suspected that the author’s imagination misled him, for we find one of his countrymen (Dr. B. Thiersch) in a little essay on the nature of Greek accent, explicitly declaring: “Mihi quidem invenire lucusque non contigit qui secundum accentum pronunciantes syllabarum mensuram servarent.” Zumpt again (Gr. § 35) says: “In our own language accent and quantity coincide.” Hermann lastly and Buttmann lend the sanction of their names to the doctrine we are controverting.

Now, as to *possibility* of combining both accent and quantity, we at once answer that it is possible, but we admit no more. In all such questions, the only safe course is to reason from the known to the unknown. Now the modern Greeks, it is admitted on all hands, strictly observe the accentual marks, but utterly disregard the power of the *η* and *ω*, &c. Their authority therefore, so far as it is entitled to weight, is against the doctrine we are combating. But we need not tie ourselves down to the observation of any one particular language. Let an Englishman or a German look to that language with the sounds of which he is most conversant, and it is believed that upon trial he will find the following principles to be true: first, that every word has an accent, and secondly, that the accented syllable possesses at once three distinctions—greater height of tone, greater volume of sound, and greater length of time. Again, a word may have several long syllables, as *invented*, *forecastle*, Eng.; *arbeiten*, *vergrössert*, Germ.; *clamabant*, *dolores*, Lat.; *πειθεσθαι*, *γρα-*

ψαντων, Gr. ; but among these one will predominate and be heard above its neighbours, which then losing their importance, are often compelled to serve as short syllables, especially in those languages which, like the German and our own, abound with consonants, and consequently with syllables long by position. But Englishmen and Germans, taught by the necessity of the case, acquire a wonderful power of scrambling over the most fearful combination of consonants. The Latin too, compared with the Greek, stands in the same unfavourable position ; thus the senarii and other metres of Terence are weighed down by consonants, so that they rarely bear comparison for beauty with the iambics of the Greek tragedians. Still it is highly probable that we pronounce many consonants in the Latin language which were slurred over in pronunciation by the natives. But this is a subject we have discussed elsewhere. We will here only observe on this head, that we find in the Latin language many examples of syllables which were once long, eventually losing such length of quantity beside an accented syllable. The final syllables of *clamat*, *clamabat*, are known to have been originally long, in agreement with the power of the same vowel in the other persons of the same tenses, *clamās*, *clamāmus*, &c., and with the passive forms deduced from them, *clamātur*, *clamabātur*. *Scriptserunt* again was soon reduced to *scripsere*. And on the other hand, the initial syllables appear to have suffered from a similar cause in *molestus*, *cūrulis*, *ōfella*, *māmilla*, *lūcerna*, *prōfecto* (adv.), these words being closely akin to *mōles*, *currus*, *offa*, *mamma*, *lux lūcis*, *prō facto*.

But our opponents throw in our teeth such words as *στρατοπεδον*, *αγαθος*, *epis*, *familia*, *aperit*, *fācit*, *cāno*, *honesty*, &c., and defy us to accentuate them without doing violence to our own principles. In replying to this challenge, we would first notice, that in accentuating the first syllable of *honesty*, although from the shortness of the vowel and the presence of but a single consonant, we require but little time for the pronunciation of *hon*, yet after the effort we either pause awhile, or what in this case is equivalent, dwell upon the nasal liquid. We have taken the word *honesty* because it happens to be the

word selected as a test by Mr. Pennington. Had he proposed the word *faculty*, then the syllable *fac* taking up as short* a time as any syllable well can, our practice is to eke out the time which the importance of the syllable demands by a mere pause. Nor are we arguing any new point in saying that the presence of an acute accent has a natural tendency to lengthen a syllable. We will not appeal to the scholiast (see Primatt, p. 69), be he Longinus or otherwise, whose note on Hephaestion begins with a statement most suited to our purpose, for we admit that the extravagance of what follows wholly destroys the authority of the witness. Already the words τῆς ὀξεΐας μηκυνούσης τὸ ὄ, as used by him, would be more satisfactory if not applied to the special case of *οφίς* in Homer; but when we find our witness contending that the presence of an acute in one syllable has the power of lengthening either a preceding or following syllable, we feel that he is wanting in one of the first requisites for the character of a witness, common sense. But it will not be out of place to quote from Primatt's work the authority of Dionysius Thrax (p. 71): *τόνος πρὸς ὃν ἄδομεν καὶ τὴν φωνὴν εὐρυτέραν ποιοῦμεν*; of Hermogenes (p. 76): *τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν ἡ τάσις, τὸ ἀποτετάσθαι ἐπὶ μακρότερον ἢ χρὴ τὸ πνεῦμα*; and of Hesychius (Pref. p. xv.), where he interprets *ἐπιτεῖναι* by *μεγαλύναι*, *μακρύναι*, and *ἐπιτείνεται* by *ἐπὶ τῷ ὄντι πλεονάζει, ἢ αὔξει, ἢ εἰς ἐπίδοσιν ἄγεται*. Dionysius too of Halicarnassus (ibid. p. 146), gives a practical sanction to the doctrine that accent carries with it lengthened time, when, commenting on the passage of Thucydides—*ὦς καλὸν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐκ τῶν πολέμων θαπτομένοις ἀγορεύεσθαι αὐτόν*—he says, *ἄρχεται μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ κρητικοῦ ποδός*: for if *ὦς καλὸν* before *ἐπι* is to be a cretic, the last syllable of *καλὸν* must of course be long. Then as regards the Greek and Latin words just enumerated, there is reason for believing that in many instances they were curtailed in pronunciation by one of their syllables. Hermann, in some measure fol-

* Mr. Pennington seems to have thought that it takes a longer time to utter a syllable such as *fāc* than *fa* without a final consonant. His eye seems here to have deceived him; for a mute final consonant after a vowel is no sound, only the stoppage of a sound.

lowing the footsteps of Bentley, has shown for Plautus and Terence that such words as *miseria*, *familia*, are to be pronounced much as *mís'ria*, *fám'lia*; and thus we get over two difficulties at once, for the accent falls on what is virtually a long syllable, long by position; and we are no longer violating the rule which limits the position of an accent to one of the last three syllables, as the syllable receiving the accent is virtually an antepenult. Further, the principle practically exemplifies the oft-repeated doctrine that one long equals two short syllables. What we have said of the Latin word *familia*, &c., is also applicable in no slight degree to the Greek words of like form. Although *στρατοπεδον* and words of the same metrical power might occupy any place in a Greek trimeter iambic, if we are only to obey those laws which define the feet admissible in each place, yet practically it is far otherwise, for the word is only admissible where the pronunciation *στράτ'πεδον** falls in with the requirements of the verse, that is, the syllables *στράτ'πε* must always occupy the position of a trochee. And this law, though rarely noticed in our metrical treatises, was well known to Hermann, who has specially commented

* We do not consider the position of such a word at the outset of a trimeter as violating the principle, for Greek iambs agreed with our own in the occasional admission of what was virtually a trochee in this place. As we, for example, in a series of iambic lines readily admit a verse which has an accent on the first syllable, *e.g.* 'Breathes there a man with soul so dead,' and 'This is my own, my native land'; so also in Terence there abound such lines as—'Sic me Di amábunt út me tuárum míseritumst,' &c. (Haut. iii. 1, 54); 'I'd sibi negóti crédidit solúm dari' (Andr. prol. 2); 'Dehinc ut quiescant porro moneo et desinant' (ib. 22). But they are also of frequent occurrence in the Greek tragedians. We cannot have more distinct examples than the iambic senarii beginning with *Παρθενопαιος* (Sept. ad Theb. 553); *Ιππομεδοντος* (ib. 484); *Αλφεισιβοιαν* (Soph. fragm.). But if it be objected that here a licence was excusable in favour of proper names, we appeal to such a line as—*τι ποτε πεπονθας; ουκ ερεις, αλλ' ὡδ εσει*, Soph. Phil. 740, for *τι ποτε* is only another way of writing what Homer puts in the shape *τιπτε*. So again in the same play *τίπτε* 914, *έχετε* 789, *άποδος* 932 and 981, *άφιλον* 1018, *άφετε* 1054, *Έλενος* 606, *δóλιος* 608, *πέλαγος* 636, all of which closely approach to trochees. We would claim too, as of the same character, *Δος μοι σεαντον' κáτα τον λοιπον χρονον* 84, and lines beginning *ευ νυν* 1240, *πως ουν* 110, *συ μεν* 123.

on a violation of the principle in the Philoctetes in the case of πολεμῖος* (v. 1307). Similarly we hold that *aperit* is often to be pronounced *ap'rit* (compare the Italian *aprire*, Fr. *ouvrir*), and αγαθος as ἀγ'θος. Of the shorter words *εἰς*, *facit*, *cano*, something will be said below.

We have just said that every word has an accent, but in so doing we did not forget the important family of particles called *enclitics*, or those to which Hermann has given the not well-invented name *proclitics*. The fact is, that inquiries of this nature are much damaged for want of a precise definition of the term 'word.' Instead of leaving our printers to supply the definition for us by inclosing what they are pleased to consider a word between two little spaces of white paper, let us rather define what we mean by referring, not to printed matter, but to articulate sound. We hold then a *word* to be so much of discourse as is clustered round one accented syllable, and divided by a short pause at either end. Thus an enclitic goes to form a word with what precedes it, a proclitic with what follows it; and under these terms we would include many particles not commonly classed with them. Hence in Greek we would claim as enclitics all those particles to which the first place in a sentence is denied, as *μεν*, *γαρ*, *δε*, and for this, in despite of our grammars, we have the authority of Choeroboscus (see Hermann de emend. rat. Gr. Gr. p. 77). Many a line in Greek poetry will be found much improved by such treatment of these particles. Again, we would include not merely what falls under the last-named condition, but also those words, which, commonly entitled to the first place, occasionally surrender the privilege to some important word. Thus, for example, the conjunctions *ut*, *si*, *quam*, &c., when postponed, are to be treated, we think, as enclitics; and especial attention is due to the weakened power of the relative under like circumstances. Hence Bentley, we cannot but think, would have done better in the introduction to his Terentian Metres, had he marked the last half of Virgil's line

* στυγεις πολέμιον δυσμενη θ' ἡγούμενος, where his note is: *Observa πολέμιον, ictu numeri in secundam, non, ut in antiqua tragoedia solebat, in primam incidente.*

Troiaé-qui primus ab-óris. This position of the relative at the end of the fourth foot is very common in Virgil, and we doubt whether there are many such lines in which it fails to occupy the humble character of an enclitic, and so to add weight to the word to which it is appended. In *ingéns-cuï lumen ademptum*, for example, it has been long ago observed that *ingens** has no connection with *monstrum*. In the German language, as contrasted with our own, it is soon noticed by the learner that the reflexive *sich* often tries to hide itself as it were after the first emphatic word in a clause. So *se* and other pronouns in Latin, when supporting, as they often do, a subordinate part, take post behind some important word, especially behind the first word in a clause, as *Illá se jácet in-aúla Æolus, Múltum ille et terrís jactátus et álto*. Nay, even a substantive so placed should often be attached to the preceding word, and so slurred over in pronunciation as to have no accent, as *dea* in the passage—*Hic illius arma, Híc currús fuit, hóc regnúm-dea gentibus esse*. Further, it is a common remark in the Greek grammarians, that a preposition placed after its noun is liable to a change of accentuation. Probably the right view is to attach it to that noun as an enclitic, as in Latin—*Et soror et conjunx, uná-cum gente tot ánnos*; and a little below—*magnó-cum múrmure móntes*. But if it seem a bold step to treat the relative and other pronouns as well as substantives as not very rarely enclitics in poetry, what will be thought of our daring, when we venture to claim the verb itself as occasionally so degraded both in verse and prose? Dr. Carey, in his ‘*Latin Prosody made Easy*,’ proposes that in the line—*Caeruleo per summa levis volat aequora curru*,—the verb *volat* should be pronounced in immediate connection with *levis*, ‘*levís-volat*.’ To this proposition we give a cordial assent. Indeed whenever a Latin verb leaves what is, so to say, its natural position at the end of its clause, it does so either on account of its own emphasis, in which

* Thus the line should be printed: *Monstrum, horrendum, informe, ingéns cuï lumen ademptum*. *Ingens* is again applied to the eye a few lines below, and though the organ was gone, it was well to speak of the vast cavern which had once held it.

case it seizes the first place in the same clause, or else because it is unimportant in itself and so sneaks into some corner behind an emphatic word. And this is a matter which seems to admit of explanation from first principles. As the verb in the logical view of a sentence commonly constitutes an important part of the predicate, so it has a natural tendency to combine closely with any leading element of the same predicate, and so lend it importance. Thus the very line of Virgil which Mr. Pennington selects as irreconcilable with the doctrine that accent and quantity are compatible, we are willing to accept at his hands, for we would read it thus: *Quadrupedánte putrém sonitú-quatit úngula cámpum*. The words *quadrupedante sonitu* contain the most important part of the predicate, and accordingly they become prominent, the one by occupying the place of honour at the commencement of the line, the other by preceding the verb and having it attached to it. Thus *volat* and *quatit* having in these lines no accents on themselves may in some sort be entitled enclitics. Examples of what is here said we hold to be abundant in Latin poetry, as *Celsá-sedet* *Aéolus árce*, *crebrís-micat* *ígnibus aéther*, *rapidús-vorat* *aéquore vórtex*, *totó-videt* *aéquore clássem*. At othertimes, although the verb may have an accent of its own, yet still combining with the preceding word, it often affects the accent of that word. Thus in the same book we have (v. 134), *Tantás-andétis* *tóllere móles?* where the very peculiarity of the accent of *tantás*, as in *celsá*, *crebrís*, *rapidús*, *totó*, throws an emphasis upon it.

We believe it was Hermann who first drew special attention to the principle which accounted for the non-accentuation of such Greek words as *ó, ἡ, ου, εν, εκ, ει* and *ώς*, viz. that they are to be pronounced with the word following. But we are tempted to enlarge the number. Quintilian tells us for example that in Latin *circum littora* was pronounced with but one accent, and undoubtedly there is so close a connection between preposition and noun, that they may be well regarded as constituting but a single word. Thus, in our own language, *against him*, *before us*, *behind me*, however written or printed, are pronounced together; and it is hence perhaps that our disyllabic prepositions have the accent on the last syllable,

contrary to the general habit of our own, as of every other language, with other words. So also in Latin, *intér-nos*, *intér-se* must invariably be pronounced in verse as here written, if we value the metre; and therefore no doubt also in prose. Perhaps then we have here the true key to the fact that Greek disyllabic prepositions are commonly accented on the final syllable. Nay, in the fragment of Herodian published by Hermann (p. 309), we find part of a line quoted from Callimachus, where *παρά* seems to have the last syllable long, *παρά τινος ἡριον ἴσταντε τουτο*; and indeed *παρά* is only *παρά* so lengthened.

When we said above that every word has its accent, we purposely expressed the proposition with unqualified generality, under the feeling that proclitics and enclitics are not themselves words. It must have been in the same sense that Diomedes, de Accentu (lib. 2), says: *Ut nulla vox sine vocali, item sine accentu nulla est.*

In some of the preceding remarks we have assumed that the Latin language was not without oxytons, and have even ventured to affix an acute accent in one passage to the final syllable of *putrem*, but we are ready to admit that the final syllable of this word, as also the final *o* in *arma virumque cano*, were not pronounced with a well-marked acute, for they terminate the first portion of the hexameter, where there is a sort of pause. But this it will be said is a direct defiance of the authority of Quintilian. This is true, for he says most distinctly: *Est autem in omni voce utique acuta, sed nunquam plus una: nec ultima umquam: ideoque in disyllabis prior.* But at any rate he admits, a few lines above, that *quidam eruditi, nonnulli etiam grammatici* insisted on giving an acute to the last syllable of some words, and if they are said to have limited this privilege for the most part to adverbs and pronouns, the qualification ‘for the most part’ (*adverbiis fere solis, &c.*), is of some service to us. Besides, it has been observed by others (Camerarius and Primatt) that Quintilian was in the habit of limiting his rules somewhat unduly by reference to the particular cases before him. Thus, after saying that the Latin grammarians *Olympo et tyranno acutam mediam*

syllabam dederunt, he adds the reason: quia duabus longis sequentibus primam brevem acui noster sermo non patitur. Now we have here one if not two inaccuracies. The rules he himself has laid down a few lines above, tell us distinctly that the quantity of the last syllable is no element in the question of Latin accent, all depending on whether the penult syllable be long; and for a similar reason the words *primam brevem* have no application. But, as his commentators observe, he was improperly led to introduce these additional qualifications, because he happened to have the words *tyrannō* and *~Olympō* before him. His language, to be correct, ought to have included such forms as *sēducīt*. Probably then his mind, in dealing with the accents of verbs, had before it the infinitive mood, and then undoubtedly *amāre*, *monēre*, *régere* (pronounced perhaps *rēhre*, comp. the French *lire* from *legere*); and *audīre*,—would fall in with the laws of accent as laid down by him. Nay, we find it asserted by Zumpt, that *Mæcenās* and other words in *as*, whose genitive is similarly formed, had an acute on the final; but, not able at the moment to find his authority, we are afraid to rely on such evidence. On the other hand, it is admitted that the metres of Plautus and Terence were guided by accent alone; and if so, their pages furnish abundant examples of disyllabic words, which, having a short penult, accentuate the final, as *voló*, *putá*, *paró*, *sitás*, *velís*, in the first seven lines of the first scene of the *Andria*; and if it be objected that these words occur all of them at the end of a line, so as to suggest that some peculiarity of pronunciation belonged to the close of a Latin senarius, we will point to examples in the same scene where there is no such limitation, as *metús* v. 2, *canés* v. 30, *amáns* v. 49, *boná* v. 92, *rogó* v. 97, *moraé* v. 139. And further be it observed on the other hand, that not a single instance occurs of words so formed having the accent on the penult. Such a fact we regard as infinitely outweighing the authority of a single passage in Quintilian. Perhaps too Quintilian, relying on his ear, may have thought of words like *bōnūs*, *tībī*, *mālē*, as monosyllables—*bon*, *ti*, *mal*—for such we believe they generally were in common discourse, a question we have discussed at length elsewhere.

But we find what we believe to be another powerful argument in the fact, that ancient writers themselves, Greek and Latin, did not draw that broad line between quantity and accent which modern writers assert in their behalf. We have already made references to passages which go far to prove this. But we have some little matter to add. In the first place, *prosody* and *accent* are two words which are precise translations one of the other. Again, Priscian in his treatise ‘De Accentibus,’ after giving the rules for what our existing grammars call the *quantity* of substantives and adjectives, says: *Regulis accentuum nominis expositis, tractandus est accentus qui in verbis consideratus certis definiendus est regulis*; and then he proceeds to give the *quantity* of the different parts of the Latin verb. Thus Roman writers, where the sole object is to define the quantity of this or that syllable, often, like ourselves, apply the terms of accentual language. Quintilian, for example, in dealing with the Virgilian line ending *pecudes pictaeque volucres*, has the words—*Evenit ut metri quoque conditio mutet accentum Nam volucres media acuta legam: quia etsi natura brevis, tamen positione longa est, ne faciat iambum quem non recipit versus heroicus.* Gellius also says, iv. 7: *Valerius Probus Grammaticus. . . . Hannibalem et Hasdrubalem et Hamilcarem ita pronuntiavit ut paenultimam circumflecteret*, and this on the authority of Plautus and Ennius, from the latter of whom he quotes the line (apparently wanting some syllable, as *hi*, at the beginning):—*qui propter Hannibalis copias considerant*; and secondly, vii. 7, *Annianus poeta affatim, ut admodum, prima acuta, non media pronuntiabat; atque ita veteres locutos censebat. Itaque se audiente Probum Grammaticum hos versus in Plauti Cistellaria, legisse dicit Aliorum est affatim qui faciant. Sane ego, &c.*; *causamque esse huic accentui dicebat quod, &c.* We are aware that our opponents will tell us that to define the accents of the words is in these instances from Quintilian and Gellius indirectly to define the quantities of the penults. Be it so; but this reminds us that we have yet to ask them a question, the solution of which on their theory seems never to have been attempted. If accent be so utterly different from quantity, if it denote solely the height of the

note without any reference to its duration, how is it that the position of the accent in a word is in any way dependent on the quantity of the syllables which compose the word?

How far the preceding arguments have succeeded in establishing the point that the system of Greek accentuation, as taught in our grammars and practised in printed books, is not applicable to the writings of the Greek poets or prose writers from Homer down to Aristophanes, if not lower, is a matter about which others must form a judgement. It may be useful however to protest against some arguments which have been produced to encourage the study of the existing system. Porson, for one, dwells on the advantage which they offer for distinguishing words of like form in other respects. To this Mr. Pennington himself has replied, in a manner we think unanswerable: "As to the use of them in distinguishing words which are written alike, these are few, and there can be no need to encumber with marks all the rest of the book: nay, the very fact of our observing a mark upon those words alone which require it, would better direct our minds towards their true meaning in those very few passages where it does not necessarily result from the context." A second argument which we have heard in its favour, is that they constitute an important aid towards distinctions in grammatical formations; for example, when we know that *ελπίς* and *χλαμύς* are oxytons, we may also fix upon our memory that their accusatives must be formed in *α*, *ελπίδα*, *χλαμύδα*, whereas *έρις* and *όρνις*, though forming two accusatives, give a decided preference to *έριν* and *όρνιν* over *έριδα* and *όρνιθα*. But how are we to recollect that *ελπίς* and *χλαμύς* are oxytons? Surely there can be no gain here for the memory, for it is a task of precisely the same severity to remember at once which substantives of this declension form their accusatives in *α*, and to remember which have an acute on the final of the nominative*. Buttmann however puts for-

* It has been contended however, that the accented pronunciation of the final syllable of *ελπίς* may be the very reason why the *δ* was retained in the accusative. This, if true, has its value; but as a mere *memoria technica* the principle is worthless.

ward another claim in behalf of accents. In his Grammar (11. 8. Ann. 7), he says: "It will be at once seen how the beginner who uses accurate editions may, by the help of accents, learn the quantity of many syllables;" and why can he do so? simply because the quantity to a certain degree determines the accent, so that here again we have a sort of reasoning in a circle. At any rate, it would be a much more simple, and incomparably a much more effective way of attaining the object, at once to mark the quantity of all the doubtful vowels.

A recapitulation of our arguments might be of service, but want of space forbids this. We may however observe, that in our argument we have throughout given the same idea to the word accent, and have endeavoured to explain metrical laws on one consistent principle; and moreover that we have used the term accent always in that simple sense which an Englishman adopts in speaking of his own language. All again admit that the modern Greek employs the system of accentual marks in the sense for which we contend, and we have seen in the Roman comedians that accent was the governing principle of all their metres. Further, we have seen, that so early as Plautus, and so late as Prudentius, it was the practice, in borrowing a Greek word, to take it with the pronunciation which the accent denoted. Thus we contend for one uniform principle of accentuation, as governing pronunciation, subject

Μῦθος τοῦ Ῥώσσου ποιητοῦ Κριλλώφ.

Η ΘΗΛΕΙΑ ΤΟΤ ΚΟΤΚΟΤ.

Ἡ ἄστατος ἡ σύζυγος τοῦ Κούκου ἐπὶ κλόνου

Ἰτέας ποτ' ἐκάθισε καὶ γοερῶς ἐθρήνει

Ἡ γείτων της περιστερὰ τὸ αἶτιον τοῦ πόνου

Τὴν ἐρωτᾷ, καὶ διατὶ κρουνοὺς δακρύων χύνει;

of course to what is a law of all languages, that individual words from time to time modify their accent, and that orthography is too often in arrear of orthoepy. Our opponents, on the other hand, have constantly to shift their ground. Accent in Homer and Sophocles, according to them, means something very different, not only from accent in English and Latin, but from accent in modern Greek. Another problem, which must cause them we fear no little trouble, is to explain away the fact, that the grammarians of Greece and Rome are constantly employing the terms which belong to the category of accent in speaking of what is vulgarly called quantity. Lastly, we must again remind them of the fact with which we set out, that their own habit of practically ignoring the very marks on which they set so high a value is a standing evidence against their theory.

As a specimen of modern Greek poetry, we give the following from a periodical*, where we recommend to special notice the short penults of *ἔρωτᾶ, κυνηγῶν, θρηνεῖς, ἡγάπησα, θεωρῶ, ἀνοιξίν, ἔραστοῦ, γειτόνισσα, ἀγανακτεῖς, γνώριζεν, μάλιστα, ῥίψασα, ἐμέμφοντο, &c.*; and no less the long penults of *ἰτέας, δακρύων, θέα, φιλτάτη, εὐλόγως, γειτόνων, τίνος, μεγάλην, ἀδίκως, αὐγά-μου*; and the long finals of *σκληρὰ, καιρὸν, μέ.* The fact of the verses being in rhyme is partly obscured to those who are not aware that the vowels *ι, η, υ*, and the diphthong *ει*, have all of them now the sound of *ee* in our word *feet*.

Fable of the Russian Poet Krilloff.

THE FEMALE CUCKOO.

Th' unsettled one, the cuckoo's mate, had perched herself one morning
Upon a branch of a willow tree, and mournfully was wailing;
A neighbour bird, the turtle-dove, the cause of all this trouble
In pity asks, and why the springs of tears she sends a-gushing.

* ΑΠΟΘΗΚΗ ΤΩΝ ΩΦΕΛΙΜΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΕΡΙΝΩΝ ΓΝΩΣΕΩΝ.
ΕΤΟΣ Β'. 1848 ΦΕΒΡΟΥΑΡΙΟΣ. 'ΑΡΙΘ. 8. ΕΝ ΣΥΡΩ.

—Μήπως, καλὴ γειτόνισσα, τὴν ἀνοιξιν λυπεῖσαι;
 Τοῦ ἔραστοῦ σου μὴ θρηνεῖς ἴσως τὴν ἀπιστίαν;
 Μήπως ἐπιβουλὴν τινὰ τῶν κυνηγῶν φοβεῖσαι;
 * Ἡ μήπως περιέπες εἰς τὴν σκληρὰν χηρείαν;

—Ὅχι! πολὺ σκληρότεροι πᾶναι μὲ τυραννοῦσι!
 Τὴν ἀνοιξιν ἠγάπησα, καὶ μήτηρ εἶχον γένει,
 Πλὴν τὰ σκληρὰ τὰ τέκνα μου μὲ φεύγουν, μὲ μισοῦσι!
 Τὸν θάνατον ἐπιθυμῶ! ὁ κόσμος μὲ βαρύνει!

* Ὅταν τριγύρω θεωρῶ πουλάκια ἄλλα νέα*
 Νὰ κρύπτωντ' εἰς τὰς πτέρυγας τῆς εὐτυχοῦς μητρός των,
 Μὲ καταξαίνει τὴν ψυχὴν ἡ τρυφὴ τῶν θέα,
 Καὶ ἐκ τοῦ φθόγου τήκομαι τ' ἀθώου ἔρωτός των!

—Εὐλόγως, ὦ φιλότατῃ μου, ἀγανακτεῖς, λυπεῖσαι,
 Κἀνείς ὅμως δὲν γνώριζεν ἐξ ὅλων τῶν γειτόνων
 Οὔτε πῶς ἔχεις φωλεὰν, οὔτε πῶς μήτηρ εἶσαι.
 Πότε καὶ ποῦ τὴν ἔκτισες; εἰς τίνος δένδρου κλόνον;

Καὶ τὸν καιρὸν ὅτε γεννοῦν, σὺ μάλιστα πλανῆτις,
 Τριγύριζες ἀμέριμνος καὶ μὲ χαρὰν μεγάλην,
 Κ' ἡ καρακάξα ἡ γλωσσού, κ' ὁ φλύαρος σποργίτης*
 Ἐμέμφοντο τὴν τόσῃν σου μωρίαν καὶ σπατάλην.

—Δὲν εἶμαι τόσ' ἀνόητος διὰ ν' ἀποφασίσω
 Τ' ἄνθος τῆς ἡλικίας μου ἀδίκως νὰ μαραίνω
 Διὰ νὰ κτίζω φωλεὰν, κ' ἐκεῖ ἀφοῦ καθίσω,
 Ἀκίνητος ὥσάν νεκρὰ, τ' αὐγά μου νὰ θερμαίνω!

Θέλουσα δὲ τῆς μητρικῆς στοργῆς νὰ συμμεθέξω,
 Τὸ ἐν αὐγὸν μου γέννησα εἰς φωλεὰν σποργίτου,
 Ἐπιτηδεύω ρίψασα τὸ ἰδικόν του ἔξω.
 Καὶ τ' ἄλλο εἰς τὴν φωλεὰν γλαυκὸς τῆς ἀνοήτου.

—Λοιπὸν, λέγ' ἡ περιστερὰ, ἀφοῦ τοιαύτῃ εἶσαι,
 Δικαίως καὶ τὰ τέκνα σου σὲ φεύγουν, σὲ μισοῦσι.
 Οὔτ' ἔχεις δὲ δικαίωμα κἄν μήτηρ νὰ καλῇσαι.
 Κ' αἱ λύπαι σου τὰ σπλάγχνα μου εἰς οἶκτον δὲν κινοῦσι.

* The inverted ι with a circumflex below it, as found in these lines, is the modern symbol of the sound y, as heard in *yes*.

D. Is it, fair neighbour, that thou 'rt grieved for spring so quickly flitting ?
Or dost lament perchance the guilt of some unfaithful lover ?
Or hast thou cause to tremble at a sportsman's machinations ?
Or into wretched widowhood, that worst of griefs, art fallen ?

C. No, no, kind friend, distresses much more horrible oppress me,
The spring-tide I like others loved, I too have been a mother ;
But now my wicked children, oh ! they shun my sight, they hate me ;
I long for death, I long for death, the world to me's a burden.

Whenever looking round I cast my eye on other pullets,
As into a happy mother's wings so lovingly they hide them,
The sight of all that tenderness, it rends my heart to pieces.
I pine away for envy of their innocent affection.

D. Reason indeed thou hast, my dear, for broken-hearted sorrow ;
And yet not one among us knew, not one of all thy neighbours,
Or how thou didst possess a nest, or how thou wert a mother. [chosen ?
When didst thou build that nest, and where ? what tree, what branch was

And when the rest were breeding, thou, engaged in nought but gadding,
Didst whirl about, bereft of care, an idle bird of pleasure ;
And e'en the magpie-chatterer, and e'en the prattling sparrow
Cried, Fie on such a silly life, on such unthrifty doings !

C. Pooh ! pooh ! I'm not the dolt you think, to pass on myself the sentence,
That for my sins the bloom of youth must droop and wither idly ;
That I must build a nest and then sit in that nest a-moping,
Still as a corpse, and all to keep two or three eggs from chilling.

But wishing still t' enjoy a share of a mother's kindly feelings,
One of my eggs within the nest of a heedless sparrow dropping,
I cleverly threw out an egg of hers to make it even.
A second egg that wiseacre the owl had taken charge of.

D. Enough, enough ! exclaims the dove, since such thine own behaviour,
Truly have e'en thy children cause to shun thee and to hate thee ;
Nor canst thou justly claim to be so much as call'd a mother.
Such griefs as thine will never move my bowels to compassion.

The Meeting was adjourned till the 8th of June.